

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-32 are pending in the application, with 1, 5, 13, 14, 22, 27-32 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 3, 13, 22 and 27-32 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22-26, 29 and 32

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 22-26, 29 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 20020161826 to Arteaga et al. (hereinafter, "Arteaga") in view of U.S. Pub. No. 20050171762 to Ryan et al. (hereinafter, "Ryan"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 22, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, ". . . storing usage data corresponding to the occurrence of at least one user initiated event on the mobile client device by accessing one or more processes running on the mobile client device; " Arteaga and Ryan, considered alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature of claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claim 22 and its dependent claims 23-26 be passed to allowance.

Independent claims 29 and 32 are patentable over Arteaga and Ryan for at least the same reasons as claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these independent claims, and their dependent claims, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 10-13, 19-21, 27-28 and 30-31

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 10-13, 19-21, 27-28 and 30-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 20020161826 to Arteaga et al. (hereinafter, "Arteaga") in view of U.S. Pub. No. 20050171762 to Ryan et al. (hereinafter, "Ryan") and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 20040268231 to Tunning (hereinafter, "Tunning"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

". . . receiving from the server at the mobile client device at least one of (i) a web page template and (ii) application data corresponding to the website in response to the request;"

Further, this feature of claim 1 is a part of the step of ". . . synchronizing the mobile client device with a server," also recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the claimed invention recites a synchronization approach where, during a given synchronization operation, either the web page template or application data may be synchronized, or both the web page template and application data are synchronized. In other words, according to the claimed invention, the web page template and application data are synchronized independently of one another. Arteaga, Ryan and Tunning, considered either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-4 and 10-12 be passed to allowance.

Independent claims 13, 27, 28, 30 and 31 are patentable over Arteaga, Ryan and Tunning for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of the independent claims and their respective dependent claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Allowable Subject matter

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 5-9 and 14-18.


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.


Michael Q. Lee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,239

Date: March 6, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

581993_1.DOC